

perimeter wall around the perimeter of the extended heel portion of the ball striking wall, said hosel having an axis, said extension of the ball striking wall and said extension of the perimeter wall not being greater than 0.625 inches from the hosel axis in a direction perpendicular to the hosel axis.

#### REMARKS

The following submissions are in response to the requests by the Examiner in the Office Action dated April 2, 2003.

Firstly, the Examiner requests a legible copy of the 37 CFR Section 3.73 Assignee's Statement and that is submitted herewith.

Next, the Examiner has requested "a legible copy of the first page of the specification following the abstract, i.e., page 1 of the specification", and that is also submitted herewith.

On page 3 of the Office Action, it is stated: "The originally filed application papers received 08/20/1999 along with the preliminary amendment received 01/24/2000 propose amendments to claims 1-10 that do not comply with 37 CFR 1.173(b), which sets forth the manner of making amendments to reissue applications. A supplemental paper correctly amending the reissue application is required."

The Patent Owner is somewhat confused by this objection because Claims 1 to 10 pending in this application are new Claims and are not amended original patent claims. Therefore, the requirement that the changes must be made relative to the original patent to be reissued is not understood. In order to clarify this issue, the Patent Owner has, in this Amendment, cancelled original Claims 1 to 10 and has renumbered them as Claims 19 to 28 with underlining to make it clear that these claims are new claims and are not original claims. The original patent claims, amended or not amended, issued in Reissue Application Serial No: 08/880,748, Filed: 6-23-97, which issued on November 7, 2000, into Patent No. Re. 36,950. This should clarify the record.

The Related Application data set forth in this specification has also been objected to with the statement:

"Applicant is advised of the practice set forth in MPEP Section 1451, page 1400-54, and titled, 'CONTINUATION REISSUE APPLICATION'. An appropriate amendment to the continuing data entries must be made in both the instant continuation and the parent reissue application, so that the parent-continuation relationship of the reissue applications is specifically identified and notice is provided of both reissue applications. Here, the applicant is encouraged to review the manner of making amendments to the specification set forth in MPEP Section 1453."

This has been corrected by cancelling the RELATED APPLICATION paragraph and substituting the above underlined amendment, which is believed to be in accordance with MPEP Section 1453. If this is not the case, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the Patent Owner's counsel, Dillis Allen, and every effort will be made to comply with any further requests.

As Patent Owner has made a good faith effort to satisfy these preliminary defects, it is respectfully requested that this application be examined on its merits.

Respectfully submitted,



Dillis V. Allen  
Reg. No. 22,460  
Attorney for Assignee

Dillis V. Allen, Esq.  
1080 Nerge Road - Suite 205  
Elk Grove Village, IL 60007  
847/895-9100

I hereby certify that this correspondence,  
*Response to Office Action*  
is being deposited  
with the United States Postal Service  
as First Class mail in an envelope  
addressed to: Commissioner of  
Patents and Trademarks, Washington,

May 2, 1982  
May 2, 2003

  
Attorney,

May 2, 2003  
Date